



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

desire of reading the New Testament was increased."*

We trust that the persecution of Cecchetti will have the effect of stirring up many of his countrymen to read and study the Word of God for themselves, notwithstanding all the obstacles and impediments which the agents of the Church of Rome may interpose. And we ought to return thanks to Almighty God, that He has been pleased to place us beyond the power of Romish inquisitors, and that we have been born in a free land, where we need not fear that we shall be cast into a felon's cell, if we venture, in the privacy of our chambers, to read and meditate on that blessed Book, which "is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus"—2 Tim. iii. 15.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND.

WHAT is toleration? The dictionary defines it to be an allowance given to that which is not approved. What, then, is religious toleration? An allowance given to the free and unconstrained exercise of a religion which those who have the power to prevent it do not approve. Our Roman Catholic brethren in England and Ireland, living under a Protestant Queen and Protestant constitution, which does not approve of their form of faith, but, on the contrary, solemnly protests against its errors in many important respects, and yet enjoying the free and unconstrained permission to exercise their religious worship as they please, have the largest and noblest exemplification of what is meant by religious toleration that, perhaps, the history of religion has ever afforded. Do we grudge them all this? Far from it; we rejoice at it and glory in it. We would persuade their understandings and convince their judgments by fair argument and sound reason; but we would never for a moment coerce or control their religious liberty.

But civil and religious liberty has been a party cry among politicians of a certain class, who style themselves liberals, and has been for thirty years a party toast among Roman Catholic agitators, at every political demonstration. The Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Cullen, at the Rotundo meeting in Dublin, some time since, stated that the Pope and the bishops (Roman Catholics) were the true friends of civil and religious liberty. But what do they mean by religious liberty? In a Protestant country, we know very well that they mean liberality to themselves—that liberty to exercise their own religion in Protestant countries freely which they deny to all other religions in Roman Catholic countries; elsewhere religious liberty means the liberty to oppress and banish all other professions of faith but their own. "But if he were lord in the land, and the Protestants in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? If it would benefit the cause of (Roman) Catholicism, he would tolerate you, if expedient he would imprison you, fine you, or, perhaps, banish you, (as the Pope did the respectable Roman Catholic priest, the Abbé Laborde, a few months ago); but be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the glorious principle of civil and religious liberty." These are not our sentiments, but the candid avowal of a widely-circulated Roman Catholic publication in England (the *Rambler*), expressed in the year 1851.

If the Roman Catholics of any parish in Ireland were anxious to build a chapel, and had collected the necessary funds, and had purchased an eligible site, but, after they had just laid the foundation, were prohibited by a Protestant Government from putting a single stone of the edifice upon another, would they not consider it a mockery and a mere humbug to say that this was religious liberty? And how would they be satisfied if they were told that as the English nation prohibits the burning of widows in India, so the Queen of England is in duty bound to hinder, if she can, the perpetual burning of the souls of her own people in hell? Yet this is the very apology given by the *Tablet* newspaper, for the Pope's preventing the erection of a Protestant Church in Rome; and this is what Dr. Cullen means by religious liberty when he says that the Pope is the friend of religious liberty; he means only in those cases in which liberty is to be received at the hands of the liberal and enlightened Protestants, to whom the slightest reciprocity or return is contemptuously denied. No better reason is vouchsafed for prohibiting their reading of the Bible in Tuscany, or the decent burial of Protestants in Lisbon or Madrid. In Italy, Naples, Spain, or Portugal, where the power of the Pope is dominant, the public exercise of their religion by Protestants is a crime. Compare with this, the condition of our Roman Catholic brethren in Ireland and England. Their reason is addressed when it can be approached; their attention is affectionately and respectfully invited to the hearing of truths from which they may forbear if they will; they are sometimes, we rejoice to say oftentimes, convinced, but never coerced. The only invasion of their religious liberty comes from their own priesthood and bishops who

employ menaces and terror, and sometimes physical force, to influence their religious conduct and profession. But so far as the Protestant government under which they live, and the Protestant ministers by whom they are surrounded, are concerned, they hear but the words of kindness and of protection, of counsel and encouragement.

We are not about to enter into the vexed politics of the day, or to meddle in any way with the recent discussions in Parliament or elsewhere relative to the Maynooth Endowment; but we ask any dispassionate Roman Catholic reader, does not the very existence of an endowment, in a Protestant state, of a seminary for the education of Roman Catholic priests, present the most extraordinary instance of religious toleration that even the history of Protestant England could produce? Those who struggle for its withdrawal complain—we do not say whether rightly or wrongly—that it passes beyond the fair limits of toleration, and amounts to an encouragement and patronage of what the Queen and the Parliament profess to be a schismatical creed, in the most substantial and unequivocal shape. We do not ask our readers to consider whether these people are justified in their complaints or not; such considerations as these are beyond the sphere of our inquiries, and we meddle not with them; but let them endeavour to realize the fact of an endowment of a Protestant seminary for Protestant clergymen, patronized and endowed by the Pope and cardinals in Rome, and when they have stretched their imagination to such a point as this, then, we believe, they can more temperately estimate the conduct of those Protestants, whether in England and Ireland, who are demanding the withdrawal of the endowment from the College of Maynooth by the Parliament of a Protestant country.

Liberty is one thing, liberality is another; but endowment is certainly a step considerably in advance of either; and those who are willing to concede the fullest liberty to the exercise of a faith of which they cannot approve, and are disposed to act with the greatest liberality towards those who profess that faith, may, nevertheless, with perfect consistency (but whether wisely or not we do not now pretend to say), decline to bear the responsibility of its propagation, by the endowment of seminaries for the purpose of educating a priesthood in what they believe to be serious errors in doctrine and morals.

THE APOCRYPHA.

THE controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics respecting the Rule of Faith involves two principal questions—first, Is the Rule of Faith contained in the *written Word alone*, or must we join to it the *unwritten Word (Tradition)*? Secondly, What constitutes the *written Word*? Does it include the apocryphal Scriptures or not? Does the Protestant Bible contain the *whole* or only a part of it? In short, what is the *canon* of Scripture?

The Church of these realms agrees with the Church of Rome respecting the canon of the *New Testament*; not so, however, with respect to the *Old Testament*. We acknowledge those books only to be canonical which our blessed Lord and his inspired apostles stamped with their authority, and which the Christian Church, during a period of fifteen centuries, recognised as divine. Roman Catholic theologians admit that our Lord and his apostles sanctioned the Jewish canon (which excluded the Apocrypha); they allow, moreover, that the Apocrypha was not admitted into the Christian canon for the first three or four centuries; but they contend that, at that date, and in virtue of the developing power inherent in the Church, the apocryphal books were enrolled in the Christian canon, and thenceforward continued to be recognised as the canon of the Church; and that the Council of Trent merely declared what had been the immemorial doctrine of the Church upon the subject, when it pronounced the Apocrypha to be divinely-inspired Scripture, and anathematized all who should dare to deny it.

The proofs usually relied on by Roman Catholic writers of the reception of the Apocrypha as divine by the Church, from the fourth century onward, are the following:—1. The catalogue of canonical books given by Augustine at the end of the fourth century. 2. The decree of the Council of Carthage, also about the same date. 3. The decretal of Pope Innocent I., at the beginning of the fifth century. 4. The decretal of Pope Gelasius, at the close of the fifth century. 5. The decree of Pope Eugenius IV. in the "Instruction to the Armenians," drawn up after the close of the Council of Florence, about the middle of the fifteenth century (1439).

Now, without dwelling at present upon the insuperable objection to the canonicity of the Apocrypha, arising from its admitted non-reception as canonical during the first four centuries, and which fatal objection the ingenious fiction of gradual development in vain attempts to remove,—without, we say, enlarging on this now, we will address ourselves to the so-called proofs, by which it has been attempted to show that since the fourth century the Apocrypha has been acknowledged by the Church to be inspired. We have already shown (*CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, vol. ii., pp. 112, 125) that the authenticity of the documents enumerated above under the second, third, and fourth heads, is more than questionable, and, in fact, that the evidence of their spuriousness is so strong as to de-

prive them of any weight as proofs of the point under discussion. We have shown, with reference to the decree of the Council of Carthage, that it contains a gross anachronism of no less than twenty years. We have also shown that Pope Innocent's decretal, which purports to have been written at the opening of the fifth century, was first brought to light late in the ninth century—more than four centuries and a half after it professes to have been written. And, lastly, we have shown that the evidence on which Pope Gelasius's decree rests is, in the highest degree, precarious. But, even admitting the genuineness of these questionable documents, we are prepared to prove that they lend no countenance to the Tridentine decree respecting the Apocrypha. We commence, then, by making a very important distinction, upon which the whole question turns, and which, therefore, Roman Catholic controversialists endeavour, as much as possible, to keep out of sight and ignore. The distinction referred to is that between the restricted meaning which we now exclusively attach to the terms "canonical," "Scripture," "sacred Scriptures," and the wider sense in which they were frequently used by the earlier writers. We moderns restrict their application to the *inspired* Scriptures exclusively, and this is the sense in which the terms are always understood in the controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics. But it was otherwise in times when controversy did not oblige men to use theological terms in a precise and definite sense: hence we occasionally find the term "canonical" applied by early writers, not merely to the inspired books of Scripture, but to one or more of the apocryphal books, not with the intention of placing them in the same category, as to divine authority, with the inspired books, but simply in order to express the fact that these apocryphal books were *read in the churches*, and were held in reverence, as containing rules (canons) for the *practical guidance of life*. The truth of this assertion we will establish presently, and especially we will adduce in support of it the express authority of one of the greatest of the Romish divines themselves—Cardinal Cajetan. Similarly, the earlier writers frequently quote the apocryphal books as "Scripture," and sometimes even as "divine Scripture;" but what they meant thereby was merely to distinguish the books *read in the churches*, and which, on that account, might, in a certain sense, be called *sacred* books, from the legendary stories, and spurious apocryphal writings, which, even then, certain superstitious or even heretical persons were endeavouring to palm off as genuine productions of the apostles or other inspired men. In contradistinction to these *spurious* forgeries (which were sometimes also called *apocryphal* books, because their authors and their origin were alike unknown)* the Church writers occasionally applied, as we have said, the terms "Scripture," "sacred Scripture" to what we now exclusively call the apocryphal books, to denote that they were *genuine* works, valued by the Church for the useful lessons which they contain, and, on that account, read in her public services. For this reason they were sometimes also designated *ecclesiastical* books. We may add, that another very probable reason why the term "Scripture" was so often extended to the apocryphal books in ancient times is this, that these books were bound up in the *same volume* with the inspired books, and so were naturally called by the same name.† However, that the writers who thus extend the term "Scripture," &c., to the apocryphal books had no intention whatever to *canonize* them (in our sense of the word) is clear from this, that those very same writers elsewhere apply the terms "Scripture," "divine Scripture," "Revelation," "holy Inspirations," and the like, not only to those apocryphal books which the Church of Rome rejects equally with us, namely, the third Book of Esdras, and the fourth Book of Maccabees, but even to the Prophecy of Enoch and the Shepherd of Hermas.‡ So that it is plain the terms in question were employed in a wide and loose sense, and that any argument founded upon such patristic usage by the advocates of the Tridentine decree would be useless, because it would prove too much. In further illustration of this patristic usage, we may observe, that in the English books of Homilies, the authors of which were certainly very far from recognising the divine authority of the Apocrypha, the apocryphal Book of Wisdom is several times quoted as Scripture, and even as holy Scripture.§ Nay, more, we find the highest Roman Catholic authorities themselves using the terms "Scripture," "divine Scrip-

* It is very necessary to bear this fact in mind, in order to avoid confusion: what we term apocryphal books the ancients frequently call *ecclesiastical*, and what they sometimes call apocryphal we should term *spurious* forgeries.

† The Apocryphal books and portions of books, which were all either originally composed in Greek or very soon translated into it, were incorporated with the Septuagint version of the Old Testament not long after the time of our Lord and his apostles; from the LXX. they were transferred into the Latin translations of the Old Testament, which, before the time of Jerome, were all made immediately from the LXX.

‡ Thus Clements Alexandrianus and Theodoret quote the third Book of Esdras; so does Athanasius, who yet, in his catalogue of the inspired books, excludes the Apocrypha. Ambrose quotes the fourth Book of Maccabees. Irenæus and Tertullian quote the Prophecy of Enoch; and Origen quotes the Shepherd of Hermas.

§ The first book of Homilies is generally thought to have been composed by Cramer, Ridley, and Latimer: the bare mention of whose names is a sufficient evidence of their opinions respecting canonical Scripture. The second book was published simultaneously with the Thirty-nine Articles in 1562, in which revised edition of the original Articles an addition was made to the article concerning Holy Scripture, the object of this addition being to draw a distinct line of demarcation between the canonical books and the Apocrypha, and to declare that the latter were not to be applied to establish any doctrine.

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. i., p. 120. Dublin, 1730.